

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

RECEIVED  
USDC, CLERK, CHARLESTON, S.

William Howard Rutland, ) 2009 DEC 18 A 10:26  
Plaintiff, )  
v. ) Civil Action No. 8:09-1754-SB  
Sgt. Rosemary Sanders )  
and Nurse Brodie, ) **ORDER**  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_  
)

This matter is before the Court upon the Plaintiff's pro se complaint, filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. By local rule, the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary determinations.

On November 18, 2009, United States Magistrate Judge Bruce Howe Hendricks issued a report and recommendation ("R&R") analyzing the Plaintiff's complaint and recommending that the Court grant the Defendants' motions for summary judgment (Entries 21 and 27) and deny the Plaintiff's motion to amend (Entry 30). Attached to the R&R was a notice advising the Plaintiff of his right to file specific, written objections to the R&R within ten days of the date of service of the R&R. To date, no objections have been filed.

Absent timely objection from a dissatisfied party, a district court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, a Magistrate Judge's factual or legal conclusions. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985); Wells v. Shriner's Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 201 (4th Cir. 1997). Here, because the Plaintiff did not file any specific, written objections, the Court need not conduct a de novo review of any portion of the R&R.

Accordingly, the Court hereby adopts the Magistrate Judge's R&R (Entry 38) as the Order of this Court, and it is

**ORDERED** that the Defendants' motions for summary judgment (Entries 21 and 27) are granted; the Plaintiff's motion to amend (Entry 30) is denied; and the Plaintiff's complaint is dismissed with prejudice.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**



The Honorable Sol Blatt, Jr.  
Senior United States District Judge

December 17, 2009  
Charleston, South Carolina

